



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,733	07/31/2001	John Kroeker	57622-045 (ELZK-5)	2704
7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER	
Toby H. KUSMER McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			AZAD, ABUL K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/918,733	KROEKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ABUL K. AZAD	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,5-13,26,28,29 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,5-13,26,28,29 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on June 13, 2005.
2. Claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 are pending in this action. Claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 14-25, 27, 30-32 and 34-36 have been canceled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartosik et al. (US 6,725,194) in view of Papineni et al. (US 6,246,981).

As per claim 1, Bartosik teaches, "a speech recognition system comprising":  
"a speech recognition device which receives an audio response from said respondent and transcribes said audio response to produce a corresponding text response" (Fig. 1, elements 2, 42, 45);

"a storage device for storing said audio response as it is received by said speech recognition device" (Fig. 1, element 23).

"an accuracy determination device for comparing said text response to a text set of expected responses and determining whether said text response corresponds to one

of said expected responses, wherein if said accuracy determination device determines that said text response does not correspond to one of said expected responses within a predetermined accuracy confidence parameter, said accuracy determination device flags said audio response for further review" (col. 6, lines 7-16); and

"a human interface device for enabling a human operator to hear the audio response and review the corresponding text response for the flagged audio response to determine the actual text response for the flagged response, either by selecting from a predetermined list of text response or typing the actual text response if no such match exists in the predetermined list of responses" (col. 6, lines 27-54).

Bartosik does not explicitly teach, "a querying device for posing at least one query to a respondent". However, Papineni teaches, "a querying device for posing at least one query to a respondent" (Fig. 1, DM response). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Papineni's teaching in the invention of Bartosik because Papineni teaches his invention provides a more versatile interface for interacting with users (col. 1, lines 9, 10).

As per claim 5, Bartosik teaches, "wherein said human interface device comprises a personal computer including a monitor for enabling the operator to view said text response and an audio speaker device for enabling the operator to listen to said flagged audio response" (Fig. 1, elements 4 and 34).

As per claims 6 and 7, Bartosik does not explicitly teach, "wherein said querying device includes a program having an application file, said application file including code which causes the at least one query to be posed to the respondent, a list of expected

responses and an address at which a file containing the received audio response will be stored in the storage device". However, Papineni teaches, "wherein said querying device includes a program having an application file, said application file including code which causes the at least one query to be posed to the respondent, a list of expected responses and an address at which a file containing the received audio response will be stored in the storage device" (col. 6, lines 51-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Papineni's teaching in the invention of Bartosik because Papineni teaches his invention provides a more versatile interface for interacting with users (col. 1, lines 9, 10).

As per claim 8 and 9, Bartosik teaches, "wherein said human interface device includes a graphical user interface on which the operator views said text set of expected responses wherein, after listening to said audio response, the operator is able to select one of said expected responses from said text set of expected response if the operator determines that the response corresponds to one of said expected responses" (col. 6, lines 47-56).

As per claim 10 and 11, Bartosik teaches, "wherein said graphical user interface comprises an application navigation window for enabling the operator to navigate through said text set of expected responses, and an audio navigation window for enabling the operator to control playback of said audio response" (col. 6, lines 47-66).

As per claim 12 and 13, Bartosik teaches, "wherein said graphical user interface includes a text entry window which enables the operator to enter a text response if none

of said expected responses from said text set of expected responses corresponds to said audio response" (col. 6, lines 17-36).

As per claims 26, 28, 29 and 33, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 5-13.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABUL K. AZAD whose telephone number is (571) 272-7599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHMOND DORVIL can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ABUL K. AZAD  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2654

August 17, 2005